REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 10 are pending in this application.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,394,347; hereinafter "Kita"); and Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kita in view of Giusto, Paolo et al., ("Automotive Virtual Integration Platforms: Why's, What's, and How's," IEEE 2002; hereinafter "Giusto").

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kita, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection and traverses the rejection as discussed next.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of designing a validation environment for a service implemented by an embedded electrical system, the method including, *inter alia*:

> ...assigning to said service one or more user requests and system responses of the electrical system thereto;
>
> assigning to said service a behavioral automata, said behavioral automata fixing allowed sequencing of said user requests and said system responses;
>
> automatically generating a skeleton validation environment for said service, in the form of a program executable on a simulation tool, said skeleton validation environment including a testing automata produced from a traversal of said behavioral automata, a model of initial conditions, models of user requests, models of system response accuracy, an environmental model and dataflow and control flow which assemble these models together, and said skeleton validation environment covering all user requests and resultant system responses of said service; and

2

<blockquote>
recording said skeleton validation environment in a computer readable memory device for use by a design validation tool.
</blockquote>

Kita is directed to a computer system and software that enable a designer to create a specification for a system that can be expressed as an extended finite state machine (EFSM), wherein the functions of the system are modeled as states and transitions.[1] Kita also describes that the specifications that are particularly suitable for modeling are software applications and physical systems running from alarm clocks to automatic teller machines to complex system such as aircraft.[2] However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kita fails to teach or suggest "automatically generating a skeleton validation environment for said service, in the form of a program executable on a simulation tool, said skeleton validation environment including a testing automata produced from a traversal of said behavioral automata, a model of initial conditions, models of user requests, models of system response accuracy, an environmental model and dataflow and control flow which assemble these models together, and said skeleton validation environment covering all user requests and resultant system responses of said service," as recited in Applicant's independent Claim 1.

Page 4 of the outstanding Office Action asserts that column 29, lines 18-30 of Kita describes "automatically generating a skeleton validation environment for said service." Column 29, lines 18-30 of Kita state:

---

[1] See column 2, lines 18-22 of Kita.
[2] See column 1, lines 12-15 of Kita.

For each path file generated by the system of the invention, a program shell is created, in the form of:

```
path1( ){
<test information goes here> }
```

The <test information goes here> indicates where the concatenated test information from the path file will appear. This program shell places the path file in a form for direct execution in the C language (though any other language may be accommodated with the appropriate statements).

Thus, the above portion of <u>Kita</u> merely describes that for each path file generated by the system, a program shall shell is created, and the program shell places a path file in a form for direct execution in the C language. However, <u>Kita</u> fails to describe that a skeleton validation environment for a service implemented by an embedded electrical system is ***automatically*** generated. Assuming *arguendo*, that the generating path file in <u>Kita</u> corresponds to Applicant's claimed skeleton validation environment, <u>Kita</u> fails to describe that the path file is automatically generated.

In addition, <u>Kita</u> fails to describe that the path file includes a testing automata produced from a traversal of a behavioral automata, a model of initial conditions, models of user requests, models of system response accuracy, an environmental model, and data flow and control flow which assemble these models together. Lastly, <u>Kita</u> fails to describe that the program file covers all user requests and resultant system responses of the service implemented by the electrical system.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguishes over <u>Kita</u>.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-6, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by <u>Kita</u> be withdrawn.

4

In response to the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over

Kita in view of Giusto, Applicant notes that Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1, and is thus

believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicant

respectfully submits that Giusto fails to cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Kita.

Consequently, in view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the

outstanding grounds for rejection have been overcome and that Claims 1-8 and 10 patentably

define over the prior art. Claims 1-8 and 10 are therefore believed to be in condition for

allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,944

5